



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

JO
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,450	12/02/2004	Gary E Gilbert	US 1418/04 (BWH)	2998
7590	10/18/2007		EXAMINER	
Dinesh Agarwal Law Office Dinesh Agarwal 5350 Shawnee Road Suite 330 Alexandria, VA 22312			DESAI, ANAND U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/516,450	GILBERT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anand U. Desai, Ph.D.	1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Amendment filed on July 26, 2007. Claims 7-19 have been withdrawn previously. Claims 1-6 are currently pending and are under examination.

Withdrawal of Rejections

2. The rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn based on applicants' amendment to the claims.

3. The rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn based on applicants' amendment to the claims.

Drawings

4. The drawing filed July 26, 2007 are accepted.

Pending Rejections

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-6 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-12, and 22-25 of copending Application No. 10/562,269. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the copending application are drawn to a method of blocking or reducing the binding of a protein to a binding site, wherein the binding site is subjected to a binding agent selected from a group consisting of lactadherin, a fragment of lactadherin, a functional equivalent of lactadherin, and a functional equivalent of a fragment of lactadherin. The binding site comprises a phospholipids or lipoprotein, or phosphatidylserine. The protein encompasses the coagulation proteins. The copending claims are also directed to a method of blocking or reducing procoagulant activity of a cell by subjecting the cell to an agent selected from the previously recited Markush group. The instant claim 2 describes the procoagulant molecule as part of a cell membrane. The methods encompass the same step of subjecting lactadherin, with the same end result of reducing binding between a procoagulant molecule and a coagulation molecule.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Remarks

7. Applicants' request that the rejection be held in abeyance until such time as the '269 application is patented. The rejection is still pending, because the claims are of overlapping scope with the copending application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph, enablement rejection

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of blocking or reducing access to a procoagulant membrane comprising phosphatidyl-L-serine, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method comprising a procoagulant membrane comprising any phosphatidylserine molecule. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The claims are rejected because of undue experimentation to practice the claimed method for the genus of procoagulant membranes including any phosphatidylserine molecule. The undue experimentation arises due to the predictable lack of binding of lactadherin to any phosphatidylserine, particularly phosphatidyl-D-serine molecules as currently encompassed by the claims. Claim 1 is drawn to any phosphatidylserine molecule.

In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir., 1988) eight factors should be addressed in determining enablement.

While the analysis and conclusion of a lack of enablement are based on the factors discussed in MPEP § 2164.01(a) and the evidence as a whole, it is not necessary to discuss each factor in the written enablement rejection. The language should focus on those factors, reasons, and evidence that lead the examiner to conclude that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation, or that the scope of any enablement provided to one skilled in the art is not commensurate with the scope of protection sought by the claims. This can be done by making specific findings of fact, supported by the evidence, and then drawing conclusions based on these findings of fact. For example, doubt may arise about enablement because information is missing about one or more essential parts or relationships between parts which one skilled in the art could not develop without undue experimentation. In such a case, the examiner should specifically identify what information is missing and why one skilled in the art could not supply the information without undue experimentation. See MPEP § 2164.06(a). References should be supplied if possible to support a *prima facie* case of lack of enablement, but are not always required. *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 224, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971). However, specific technical reasons are always required.

1) The nature of the invention: the instant claims are directed to a method of blocking or reducing access to a procoagulant membrane by a coagulation molecule comprising providing a procoagulant membrane comprising any phosphatidylserine molecule, and blocking the binding

site of the phosphatidylserine with lactadherin, thereby making the phosphatidylserine site unavailable for interaction with a coagulation molecule.

3) The predictability or unpredictability of the art: & 6) The quantity of experimentation necessary: & 7.) The state of the prior art: the prior art has shown that lactadherin binds selectively to membranes containing phosphatidyl-L-serine and preference for highly curved membranes. Lactadherin did not bind to phosphatidyl-D-serine containing molecules (see Shi et al., Figure 4).

Therefore, the unpredictability and undue experimentation arises due to the differing conditions of starting materials, such as the genus of procoagulant membranes comprising any phosphatidylserine molecule as currently claimed.

How would one of skilled in the art use the method with the genus of procoagulant membranes comprising any phosphatidylserine molecules, including phosphatidyl-D-serine as encompassed by the word, phosphatidylserine in claim 1?

8.) Level of skill in the art: the level of skill in this art is high, at least that of a doctoral scientist with several years of experience in the art.

In consideration of the Wands factors, it is apparent that there is undue experimentation because of variability in prediction of outcome that is not addressed by the present application disclosure, examples, teaching, and guidance presented. Absent factual data to the contrary, the amount and level of experimentation needed is undue.

Conclusion

10. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anand U. Desai, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Kathleen Kerr Bragdon can be reached on (517) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 15, 2007

AD
/Anand Desai/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1656